

Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update
Small Group Interviews Summary
September 6, 2000

OVERVIEW

Between August 1, 2000 and August 23, 2000, twelve small group interviews were conducted throughout Clark County attended by 101 people. The purpose of the interviews was to share some information about the Comprehensive Plan Update process and hear from participants their concerns, questions and guidance about how the county has a countywide conversation about the issues under review. An invitation letter was distributed in late June from the Board of County Commissioners to over 300 county citizens who had served on an advisory committee, task force and/or focus group over the past five years, asking for their attendance at one of the upcoming meetings. County staff members conducted follow-up phone calls and emails to recipients of the letter and coordinated the scheduling of a maximum of 10 people per meeting. JLA staff coordinated with Steering Committee members to follow up with additional participants suggested from the jurisdictions in the county.

A facilitator managed and recorded each of the meetings, with the assistance of a technical resource staff person from the Community Development Office and a staff contact person from the local jurisdiction. In addition, a Steering Committee member attended the majority of the meetings. The format for each meeting was the same – a 90 minute meeting starting at either 4:00pm or 7:00pm, using the following agenda, ground rules and questions:

Agenda

- Welcome, Purpose of Meeting
- Introductions
- Ground Rules
- Process Overview
- Questions for You
- Next Steps
- Close

Ground Rules

- Speak one at a time
- Share airtime

Question 1

What are your expectations of the comp plan review process? What would you like to see happen?

Question 2

Your comments about the issues under review:

- We are not solving them here!
- What are important issues for this area?
- Ideas to engage community

MEETING SUMMARIES

The following is a summary, organized in chronological order by meeting of the input received at each meeting, including attendees.

YACOLT

YACOLT CITY HALL

AUGUST 1, 2000

7-8:30PM

Attendees

Cecil Rotschy

Alan Schumacher, Clark County Citizens United

Jim Malinowski, Clark County Citizens United

Dianne McDowell

Laurel Roberts, Yacolt City Council

Jim Robertson, Mayor, Yacolt

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development

Elise Scolnick, Clark County Community Development

Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Build public faith, trust in product/process.
- Previous process ignored focus group input – left participants with sour taste.
- Be honest that public input will be used. Example is overwhelming opinion is one way – commissioners voted another way.
- Follow the GMA – do not ignore.
- Do not do public input just because it is required – use it!
- Public process needs to be done in a way that folks who take the time to participate do not feel like it is a sham.
- Commissioners and staff have a better attitude than five years ago.
- Need the county to administer policies properly – not biased. No individual agendas.
- We need to reach consensus on issues as a county.
- Need better tracking/record of how GMA goals have been addressed.
- Expectations are that current comp plan goals that do not address GMA will be revisited.
- Impression is that BOCC has already made up their mind because they have identified that some things will not be dealt with.
- Need to give reasons why there are only some issues under review right now.
- Possibly review sections of the plan over segments of time.
- A more honest process would be to allow public input in setting priorities.
- Need to look for more middle ground. So far, various factions do not seem willing to budge.
- Commissioners need to be careful that commitments that have been made about what to review (in the comp plan update) in other public processes are honored.
- Comply with GMA – define the policies for Clark County.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- Current comp plan seems to be addressing larger communities than Yacolt – did not fit well.
- How can this review speak to small town issues?
- How receptive will the county be to assist small cities to resolve concerns/inconsistencies that do not fit small communities? (As issues arise).
- Think we have gone way past the 20-year projection. Yacolt has not looked at the plan since 1994. It will be hard to play “catch up” – things are changing so fast.
- The state is made up of small towns – plan needs to do a better job addressing small town issues. State seems focused on large town mentality.
- Interested in re-looking at 80/20.

Variety of Housing

- Need to consider affordability of housing.
- Where does the 60-40 percentage goal come from? Why is that a target?

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Support further use of the land that is already settled - not talking about going into preserves, natural areas – allow far more development spread around a little.
- The intention has been to force growth in certain areas of the county, which has resulted in “planned congestion.” Should allow development in other areas.

Concurrency

- There are a lot of assumptions that should be challenged. Unclear that rural growth costs more than urban growth.
- Getting carried away with “niceties” of planning, not paying attention to practical needs. The plan needs to be commensurate with infrastructure, use more land, match with infrastructure in place.
- Cost of rural vs. urban infrastructure.

Zoning

- Why is Clark County adopting a more extreme stance on rural zoning? Need to define terms better. Rural character. Sprawl.

Population Growth

How Many Homes Per Acre

- “Smart growth” should mean what would provide livable communities, not increased densities.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

OTHER ISSUES

Resource Lands

- Some of the rural designations that were created just for open space should be revisited. Farmland just is not really there. Map shows it – could not be used is from farmland.

- GMA should not be used to preserve. Open space should be used to preserve true agriculture/forest/resource lands. GMA was too late to protect resource land in Clark County.
- Define long-term commercial significance.
- Resource lands designations need to be reviewed under the long-term commercial significance test.
- Resource lands designations for open space preservation needs to be reviewed.
- North County folks feel the resource land designations is the most critical issue.

Other Comments

- Need to explore what other counties are doing with the same questions we are struggling with.
- Be more honest with why policies are stricter than other counties in the state. Need to review the resource designations in light of new federal policies.

EAST/CENTRAL CLARK COUNTY

HOCKINSON MIDDLE SCHOOL

AUGUST 2, 2000

7-8:30PM

Attendees

Peter Nicholls, Camas City Council

John Winther, Camp Bonneville

Dave Nacke, Citizen

Larry Kytola, Citizen

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development

Derek Chirholm, Clark County Community Development

Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Can the comp plan stay the same after the review – *yes*.
- Process is only going to be meaningful if results are utilized in a positive way. Previous process was not bad, much participation, but previous process after implemented was not followed by county.
- Need different attitude from county about how input will be used.
- The choice made last time for how to manage growth seemed like a good one – county ignored it. Examples: Lot size designations - through variances, grandfathering.
- If county went back to original 1994 comp plan and updated numbers/data, we could cut this process in half! County messed up applying the plan in the first three years of implementation.
- Comp plan should encompass ways to respond to change in the county.
- Annoying to people to be dictated to. Allow local areas to decide for themselves what they would like.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- Urban area has more of a constant set of variables. We have a better sense of how that area will grow, does not work for rural areas – need more flexibility.
- Cities need to acknowledge that decisions made within the city affect smaller neighboring communities.

Variety of Housing

- Does the 40/60 housing split apply to all cities? *Yes.*
- Does not make sense. Small communities do not want to live in multifamily housing/high density in the outer areas – not common sense. This formula fits Vancouver. Does not apply to smaller cities. Infrastructure is not in place to transport people.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- How the area within the UGA is used should be left up to the local communities.
- All areas are not the same.

Zoning

- Allowing some agricultural land to be parceled off to keep farms alive.

Population Growth

How Many Homes Per Acre

- People are interested in talking about zoning/densities.
- Battle Ground, as an example, needs to be able to arrange the density targets as the market will bear.
- Adopt a county wide average density, not city by city.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Need economic incentives to encourage agriculture. Do not only focus on development bringing industry to town.
- Is the county setting aside enough industrial land?

OTHER ISSUES

Resource Lands

- Agriculture is not viable anymore. It does not matter that the land is set aside.
- Eighteen dairies in county now. Ten years ago there were 85. Milk prices have been cut 25%. Commodities are sold to other dairies – cannot collect. Do not see any really viable crops for Clark County (except maybe horses).
- Have county find out if anyone in county is making a living at agriculture.
- Ten-acre agriculture zone makes more sense. Twenty acres “farms” are not viable. People want open space, not necessarily to farm in the rural areas.

Quality of Life

- People live in small towns because they like the small town qualities.

Other Comments

- Need to let market decide more of how we grow.

- Need to show people what the effect of growth-planning is/can be on areas – give them a picture.
- Plan does not take into account the geography of an area.

DOWNTOWN VANCOUVER

CLARK COLLEGE—GASIER HALL NORTH CONFERENCE ROOM

AUGUST 7, 2000

4-5:30PM

Attendees

Mary Martin, Storm Water Commission
 Thom McConathy, Clark County WORC
 Alex Madrigal, Clark County PIO
 Kathryn Hansen, Hansen Drilling
 Craig Pridemore, Clark County Commissioner
 John Slaughter, Citizen
 Kevin Gross, The Resource Company
 Jerry Olson, Olson Engineering

Staff

Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver
 Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
 Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- What will the “topic groups” be like? How will they be organized?
- Get neighbors in community more involved. Lines on a map don’t tell the whole story.
- General public probably doesn’t have a high level of care about the big picture—GMA is a huge complicated subject. Need to relate comp. plan outcomes to individuals.
- Integration of community planning between jurisdictions is required—need to keep that in mind.
- We have unresolved conflict. The comprehensive plan needs to be the vehicle to resolve conflicts countywide.
- Need to get beyond the initial argument growth vs. no growth, then we can have a discussion.
- Need regular reviews of the comp. plan, each time we will replace land, re-evaluate population/job growth.
- Are we going to plan for growth/ or not?
- If we choose not to plan for enough growth, there will be adverse implications at the end of 20-30 years.
- Is there an opportunity in this planning process to get a clearer 50-year picture of our future.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

Variety of Housing

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- UGA looks huge—outcome needs to be a balance.

- Looks toward development North on I-5—seems as though there is traffic capacity there.
- Focus development on areas where we have traffic capabilities.
- May need to make changes to UGA. Buildable lands continue to reduce.
- Availability of buildable lands
- If/when UGA boundary will be moved—need to know where –vacant? Impacts of ESA/NPDES—how much is buildable?
- If community accepts the planning for additional population needs—where will they go?
- Can City move UGA? No County needs to move first. City doesn't have to annex.

Concurrency

- Puzzled about links with concurrency/traffic issues? How do those relate—how will they be factored in?
- Concerned about stormwater facilities and land needed.
- Balance capital facilities plan with comp. plan goals.
- Capital facilities plan linkages – how do we pay for what we need?

Zoning

Population Growth

- Population forecasts seem inconsistent.
- County doesn't have to accept a certain level of population growth?
- Within a range of forecasts how much do we grow? We can decide how much we grow.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Infill seems unrealistic in all cases. Need creative approaches to applying densities.
- Concerned about infill/densities.
- What form will the densities/allocations take? Higher density close-in—move people further out? This is a public conversation that needs to occur.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- People want to work here. We are not doing a very good job of attracting jobs here.
- Need to be more than a bedroom community.
- High profile employment is fine but more work can be provided through small businesses. Need to provide incentives for small businesses to locate here.
- Siting of small businesses is not rocket science—need to streamline the process.
- Comprehensive plan needs to eliminate disincentives for small businesses.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Need to show links to quality of life impacts with outcomes of monitoring report and the kind of growth the county wants—issues left at last time: Quantity of water
- Don't think people make connection with quality of life and comp. plan.

Environmental

- Neither ESA nor NPDES were part of the original process. Need direction from monitoring report relating to all the parts of the overall comp. Plan. Would like to see the monitoring information dealt with first. Needs to occur by a very committed thoughtful group to address. Big issue is how we downscale because we can't fund the cement plan!

- How will outcomes of NPDES be made part of this update? Technical data may not be complete in time to incorporate all aspects. NPDES/ESA will have large impacts.
- Most concerns are environmental—how will we protect stream corridors.
- Unclear about how NPDES will impact comp. plan?
- Response to NPDES is like a shot in the dark because for this comp. plan we don't exactly know what the outcomes will be.
- Need to plan for quantity of groundwater availability—long-term viability of the source. We are not protecting industrial or private wells.
- Environmental impacts are going to be great to residential properties.
- If UGB is expanded, take environmental considerations into effect.
- Look at Columbia River as water source.

WEST CLARK COUNTY

ALKI MIDDLE SCHOOL COMMONS

AUGUST 7, 2000

7-8:30PM

Attendees

Mike Viles, Bicycle Advisory Committee

Meridee Pabst for Steve Horenstein

George Vartanian, Citizen

Debbie Abraham, Felida Neighborhood Association and Parks Advisory

Mike Zent, Zent Drilling

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development

Gordy Euler, Clark County Community Development

Mary Keltz, Clark County

Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- What happens to the ideas brought up in the process?
- Need dependable feedback on what is/is not carried forward and why.
- Track individual requests that are site specific.
- Be clear on limitations.
- Don't unnecessarily restrict the public conversation.
- Give us the guiding principles, livability is paramount doesn't seem to be there now.
- Need to give public ample warning about issues that may affect them.
- Talk to people with experience in the subject.
- Will public have access to technical staff? (for the topic groups and at the assembly)
- Need a glossary of terms
- Plenty of notice.
- Roll out elements of the new plan well in advance to allow thoughtful comment (Jan 2001 – Fall 2001)
- Ditto—piece by piece allows people to focus. Not more than 5 issues per Board hearing. Rule of thumb, but consider contentiousness of issues.
- Will City reps on Steering Committee go back to their city councils for direction?

- Tie elements of plan to topic groups for early review, but show in context of full plan also.
- Make sure public knows what's going on.
- Use County web site every day.
- Win a PT Cruiser.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

Variety of Housing

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Concerned with policies about expanding UGA and limitations on new wells in UGA.
- Most important issues UGAs/UGBs and transportation.

Concurrency

- Transportation (concurrency) changing standards (deteriorating)
- Make growth pay for itself and if they can't, say no.
- Clarify connection to concurrency

Zoning

- Zoning—would like to see more stringent requirements to change zoning (i.e. impacts beyond 500 feet) and demonstrate development is in accordance with comp. plan

Population Growth

- Do we have to accept state's growth.

How Many Homes Per Acre

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Quality of life—40% multi-family. Where are the parks? Primary concern—cramming as many people as possible. Not meeting low goals.
- Just say no to growth if you can't meet the quality of life.

Other Comments

- Concerned that Comp Plan policy on prohibiting new wells not appropriate for large lots. Could relieve public sources.
- Schools—not enough concern about ability of schools to handle.
- Balance different goals, e.g. water quality regulations and pavement for pedestrian paths.
- Re-look at transportation plan

WEST VANCOUVER

FRUIT VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

AUGUST 10, 2000

7:00 – 8:30 PM

Attendees

Jake Schnoebelen, Salmon Creek
Betty Avery, Conservation Futures
Gary Eastman, Lakeside Industries
Tim Kraft, Mackay & Sposito
Rick Haddock, FBR Realty
Della Kemp Helmick, WHDNA
Ernie Goodrich, WHDNA

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
Dale Miller, Clark County Community Development
Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Would like this process to look at the population number assumptions. We were off base with the 1994 plan, let's not do that again.
- Need to include a fall back/built in flexibility to deal with unexpected fluctuations.
- Community needs to be having conversation now about a longer future – zoning issues, densities, outline future – 50 year vision.
- Sounds like a blue print approach instead of a plan – can't speculate too much.
- When does next review begin? 2.5 years after new amendments are in place, the next review starts.
- Does state board review all updates? Not necessarily.
- In previous process there were “givens” that were not up for discussion
- Public should have input into these:
 - 60/40
 - 75/25
 - population numbers

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- We are becoming an urbanizing county. Challenge is to provide services.
- Coordination/relationship between cities/county – decisions made by county now may become city problems later.

Variety of Housing

- Affordable housing – simple matter of economics. When a line is drawn around anything the price inside goes up.
- By increasing densities, affordable housing becomes available.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Is there a “formula” that can be developed to know when the UGA needs to be extended?
- When are the buildable lands max'd out in the UGA.
- What is the percent of developable land still available in UGA?

Concurrency

- If we don't have the money to do things now, we need to plan so that we have the money to do what is necessary.
- Is there any way that growth can pay for itself?

Zoning

- Need maps, meetings and education about zoning and long term look at what the zoning could be.
- Neighborhoods need to become more aware of zoning and implications and costs associated with them. Costs to count – staff time. Costs to neighborhood – time. Costs to developers – then consequentially passed onto community.
- Zoning standards need to hold fast --- too easy to get changes. Doesn't serve community well.

Population Growth

- How much of what we do locally is driven by state requirements? To some extent the population numbers are driven by the state. They need to pick one.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- If densities are increased, can roads handle it?
- Seems backwards to mess with densities in developed areas. Infrastructure can't handle it.
- Increased densities seems problematic for the infrastructure.
- Don't like the idea of infill – it will create a shortage of land over time – Look at San Francisco as an example. We need to look at other areas and learn from them

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Agree that comp plan needs flexibility – Consolidated Freightways is a prime example.
- Need to project an outline of where we are going as a county. Where employment will go.
- The county has been a bedroom community. Need to attract more industry, it's all going to Portland.
- Flexibility needs to be in where jobs/housing are located.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Livability – recreation in community/close in

Parks

- Parks is an issue – why are county residents paying for city parks? Hazel Dell needs parks.
- Is there a density level that mandates a park when reached? -- there are standards.
- Unclear about how county dollars are currently allocated related to parks.
- Is it a balancing act between land and developing it for parks later.
- Commitment/standards for parks – neighborhood parks should be prioritized.

Other Comments

- As plan is being revised, are transportation issues taken into account?
- Concerned about growth as it has occurring over the past years.
 - Planned growth versus unplanned.
- What about the \$380K grant that Community Development received – is it going to this process? It is for concurrency and growth management links.

***RIDGEFIELD
RIDGEFIELD COMMUNITY CENTER
AUGUST 14, 2000
4-5:30PM***

Attendees

Elizabeth Madrigal, Concerned Resident/Mortgage Broker
Wendi Morris, Ridgefield School Board
Bud Van Cleve, NE Hazel Dell N. A.
Nancy Ellifrit, Vancouver Audubon
Keith Pfeifer
Rhidian Morgan, Clark County Farm/Forestry Assoc.
Eric Eisemann, Ridgefield Planner
Lora Caine, Washington Conservation Voters

Staff

Dale Miller, Clark County Community Development
Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Like to see it happen in a civil manner.
- Don't know how to engage more people. How to get people to pay attention.
- Has County done follow up to polling about identification with County and Oregon?
- Have a legitimate review of comp plan.
- Process – should have what was promised last time – a stream lined permitting process as a result.
- Process – Need consistency between goals and regulations.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- Incorporated areas can't deal with the same as unincorporated. Cities aren't reaching goals. Hazel Dell growing too fast. Building in poor spots for development.
- Less growth in rural areas.

Variety of Housing

- 60/40 should be modified to set a minimum and allow each city to set their own.
- 60/40 not realistic, not achievable, other ways to get density.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- UGB does not need to be expanded, not enough developable land + market factor.
- Brownfields – owners fix to let go.
- If there's limited capacity, have developers bid for right to develop.
- Don't move boundaries. Haven't reached criteria for expanding.
- Board needs to make it clear that area will grow, i.e. vacant buildable lands study, not sure it recognizes marginal areas (wetlands, etc.)

Concurrency

- Don't see how we're going to get to concurrency.
- Make developers pay for the incidental costs of development.
- Want to make concurrency work.
- Growth pay for itself when overwhelming.
- Need market incentives for concurrency.

Zoning

- Leave zoning alone.

Population Growth

- Population projections – we're slowing down. If we aim for higher growth, we may expand too soon.
- Adjust population for growth we have experienced – be realistic.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Clark County has disincentives to infill and no flexibility.
- Reducing infill costs – justified because it's serving public goals.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Locate jobs where there is room to grow.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Love the area. Maintain quality of life. Increase cultural contribution of County.
- More schools. Quality of life – family oriented. Ridgefield = quaint.
- Get oil companies to clean up abandoned service stations and other “blight”. Need to clean up Hwy 99. Sign code enforcement. Quality of life, appearance.

Environmental

- Water quality an issue. Sewers also.
- Don't see environmental need to save open space within communities – natural areas

Other Comments

- Protect water (private wells).
- Schools – limit numbers in school, special/gifted program & internet.
- Meet current standards for development.
- Control growth by attracting it to an area, not holding it back from another.
- Reverse flow of traffic. Instead of Ridgefield to Portland, make Vancouver to Ridgefield.
- Need to have economic discussion like our planning discussion – “if we do this – these are the cost implications”.
- In the County we've gotten lazy about ecology – litter.

LA CENTER

LA CENTER COMMUNITY CENTER

AUGUST 14, 2000

7:00-8:30 PM

Attendees

W. T. Bourcer
Laura Beth Dewell, City Council
Wally Steucke
Susan Gilbert, Enterprise/Paradise N.A. ??
Bob Olson
Barbara Barnhart, L. C. Planning Commission
Elizabeth Cerveney, Mayor
Jay Cerveney, City Council
Eric Eisemann, Planning Consultant
Dennis Dykes
Steve Durspek
Val Alexander, EFHRA, FOCC

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Survey not just voters.
- Hope for more citizen participation before it happens and not just vocal citizens.
- '94 painful. Articulate that this is not starting over. Cannot be redone. Sees generalities in flyer, but no specifics. Keep discussion focused. In 5 years have seen what doesn't work. E.Q. industrial, commercial and residential growth hasn't met projections, so why are we talking about expansion.
- Inclusive of north Clark County, not exclusive.
- Tread lightly. Recognize past discussions and commitments.
- Education – What's mandated by state or county.
- Define terms.
- Need to let public have input easily.
- Yes – Definition. What's required by GMA. Groups get clear understanding of expectations and constraints.
- "What it is, what it isn't" use farther in the process.
- Lack of public trust in north Clark County. Think they (Board) only respond to Vancouver. UGA. GMA constraints have a major impact on north Clark County.
- Make it complete.
- Make sure people understand expected outcomes.
- Public officials stick to plan.
- General public doesn't understand flyer. Be specific don't beat around the bush.
- Agree – need to get the word out and educate (no acronyms).
- Are we going to prioritize issues? Should not be one size fits all.
- Need clarification of what State Board says what we can and cannot do.
- Need to make sure deliberation on and writing about issues stay focused on that issue.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- Policies worked out over last process should be firm. Rural growth 70%.

- Definitions (Topic group to define rural).
- Feel like Vancouver base dictates.
- How do we bifurcate rights of property owners from those who have no direct interest. Also, newcomer versus old timer.

Variety of Housing

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Do they have any real possibility of taking the lands from urban reserve to become UGA (in La center)? People want this to stay a small hamlet by river. If I-5 property were in UGA, that could happen.

Concurrency

- Individual jurisdictions and County demonstrate how they're going to pay for capital facilities plan.
- Concurrency important.

Zoning

Population Growth

- OFM figures in last round didn't reflect reality. Problematic for La Center last time.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Neighbors concerned about more houses.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- La Center needs industrial land – topographic plus 3 minutes to I-5.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- People that live out here do so because they want to be in the rural area, not city.

Resource Lands

- Is the definition of commercially viable agriculture mean you earn a living at it? North Clark County agriculture no longer commercially viable. If not what do we do with the land?
- “Commercially viable” needs definition.

Environmental

- Impact of ESA on comp plan and development impact will be larger in North County.
- Integration of environmental issues is plan – not in there.

Other Comments

- Consider transfer of development rights.
- Involve seniors – tie in with SNAP and SALT

EAST VANCOUVER

EVERGREEN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

COLUMBIA RIVER CONFERENCE ROOM

AUGUST 16, 2000

4:00-5:30PM

Attendees

Glenn Lamb, Columbia Land Trust
Terry Harder, Harder Architectural/CC Historic Preservation Comm
Dick Sposito, Mackay & Sposito/CCHB
Bill Connelly, Eric Fuller & Assoc.
Ara Roselani, neighborhoods
Cheri Ceridwen, neighborhoods
Lee Powell, VUO-City Aviation
Chris Hartke, Hartke & Co.
Peter Tuck, Olson Engineering

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County
Gordon Fuller, Clark County
Elize Scolnick, Clark County
Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver
Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- These processes take longer than we expect.
- Usable plan as an outcome – better address livability in County.
- Internal changes made by County without opportunity for comment by Task forces – don’t just push things through, test for reasonableness. Be concerned about quality in the product from the beginning – “later never comes” for detail.
- The timeframe is optimistic.
- Public needs to understand implications of policy that is set.
- Agree with comp plan – need to plan. Don’t think it can last for 20 years. Needs to be flexible to accommodate growth. We are ahead of projections.
- The goal of the comp plan is valid – review is a good thing.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- How do we protect the character of our county while balancing rural/urban?
- There were rural landowners in the previous plan who went ahead and subdivided their land. Who may not have, due to their concern about what could have happened. Now they are taxed at a higher rate even though they may want to continue farm/forestry activities.
- Farm/forest landowners feel that they are footing the bill for the “open space” that everyone likes to look at.

Variety of Housing

- Affordable housing.
- We have gotten away from the vision in the ’94 plan for “town center” like developments, pedestrian friendly environment, architecturally attractive, trees, etc. Models like Orenco Station.

- The challenge for this kind of development is the parcelization prescribed by the County makes it difficult. Not large enough parcels.
- The overlays make it difficult also.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- What is actually usable land? – ESA/wetlands restrictions will dictate what is buildable/developable, other restrictions.
- In phase II County needs to identify the areas where the boundaries can move so this process is successful.
- Urban reserve if not enough detail -- not large enough. Plan for change now.
- Is there a time when we say the UGA will not move any more in order to maintain county character? We will probably need to plan for mass transit/higher densities in urban areas.
- Need a credible, buildable land inventory.
- Rural areas are disapproving – continuing to move UGA out will erode the areas that people love about Clark County.
- Can the UGA be “softened”?

Concurrency

- Infrastructure needs to be thought of ahead of time.
- Concurrency is important if it is going to be a guiding light for development County needs to figure it out.
- Concurrency is the biggest issue that has come down since '94. Need to lower LOS – accommodate industry.

Zoning

- When people buy land they need to know what the future holds for the land. This process needs to be sensitive to current issues. Need to notice/information about zone change.
- County needs to incorporate a better process for public facilities zoning. City is developing a policy now. Needs to be more efficient, take less time.

Population Growth

- One of our jobs is to figure out how to accommodate the population numbers. We can't not plan for them.
- Make sure this plan begins grounded in reality. Need a solid base of assumptions.
- Population assumptions have got to be factored in. We are already behind the 8 ball

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Density requirements
 - Subdivisions
 - Outside living space (link to subdivisions)
- In previous comp plan – concerned about how the community would accept the density requirements. Not meeting the current goals – people don't understand all high density development become contentious.
- The density assumptions just aren't coming true. Folks don't want a 5,000 square foot lot. If people have a choice they may not want to live here if we keep pressing density.
- Two things people hate are density and sprawl. Need to educate folks on the tradeoffs
- Where did the 6.0 density come from?
- Need to look at the density requirements and see if they are realistic.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Industrial land has faced the “usable land” quandary.
- Industrial pays for infrastructure -- need adequate supply of industrial land that can fund needs in county.
- Industry tends not to be involved – use organizations – CREDC, etc.
- If we want the jobs we need to take the housing too.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Where is the “character” of County development? Not building a community just building houses.
- Community does not plan for kids. Parks are missing. Density does not include open space.
- Traffic is a problem for kids. Not safe, erodes livability.
- The county is undertaking a large “social experiment” – will people live here?

Resource Lands

- “Viability” of farm/forest land needs to be addressed. More clarity about core areas of prime farm/forest land and how cluster ordinance can/cannot move.

Other Comments

- Historic preservation incorporated into plan
- We can only improve our surface streets so much.
- Essential that County notify people who live near vacant land. Notification should be at a similar level to the second round of SCFRP.
- Our market assumption needs to be challenged.
- We are kind of on the frontier. Should experiment with what works.

WEST CLARK COUNTY

ALKI MIDDLE SCHOOL

AUGUST 16, 2000

7:00 – 8:30 PM

Attendees

Hal Berven

Sylvester Kobza, Mt. Vista Homeowner Assoc.

Bill Feddeler, Sierra Club/Audubon

David Taylor, Clark Cty Fire District 6

Chuck Leidy, Clark County R.R.B.

Vern Veysey, Association of Realtors

Dana Kemper

Staff

Pat Lee, Clark County Community Development

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development

Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- New folks need to be educated on needs.
- Need to demonstrate that input has been taken seriously, “not just checking the box”.
- Transcend special interest and political, focus on long term best interest for the county.
- Economic aspects of plan – pro and con – make available to public.
- Second the point on economic info – example: cost of development. Do a fact sheet with specifics.
- Ask, “If the plan is built, would you be happy?”

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

Variety of Housing

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Need better data – population, buildable land.
- More realistic buildable lands inventory.

Concurrency

- Coordination with concurrency effort.
- Capital facilities – have honest plan. (concurrency not a good idea) Honest to needs and ability to fund. We are not using bonding capacity as we should. “Do things to make it happen”.
- Financing – got to figure out a way to pay for infrastructure. Face that we are a bedroom community.

Zoning

Population Growth

- Need better data – population, buildable land.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Build with the environment – give a density and let the developer figure out how.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- All elements of the plan must be balanced. (When people live here and work in Oregon – out of balance.)

OTHER ISSUES

Resource Lands

- Need to look at farm/forest equity and fairness issues. Should be a way of distributing profits from increased values/sales in UGA to farmer/forester who lost value of their property.

Environmental

- Look at impacts to groundwater.
- More integration of drainage.
- Environmental impacts – i.e. water quality, impact of increased wastewater from growth.

- Integrate drainage plan with parks plan.
- Building codes and requirements contrary to storm water – keep with the intent and away from the detours.
- Question the value of storm water regulations. Looking at it through a microscope

Transportation

- Street issues – traffic is bad and getting worse. Neighborhood integrity and functioning roads.
- Need to provide connections through region.

Other Comments

- Hate retrofitting
- Need to plan for open spaces first and plan around them rather than the expanding rings of growth.
- Set guidelines, let private sector be creative. Need flexibility for unique situations and creativity.
- Clark County railroad. County owns. Use right of way for other public benefits, i.e. water and sewer.
- Need to lift the standards of the people building the county.
- Code covers much, but things slip through the cracks. Developments that don't follow through with requirements. Better enforcement of codes.
- Equity – we accept from agriculture what we don't accept from construction.

Top Issues

- Balancing growth between urban and rural
- Zoning
- Tracking population growth
- Financing

BATTLE GROUND

BATTLE GROUND FIRE STATION

AUGUST 22, 2000

7:00-8:30PM

Attendees

Gunars Kilpe, Retired

Kevin Snyder, COF B6

John Idsinga, C-B6

Susan Rasmussen, Agriculture Community

Jennifer Sims, County Solid Waste Commission

Ruth Queirolo, The Greater Brush Prairie

Carol Levinan, Clark County Citizen United

Betty Sue Morris, County Commissioner

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development

Bob Higbie, County County Community Development

Lianne Forney, Clark Clark County Public Information Office

Jeanne Lawson, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Get planning done on time!
- Simplify process
- Teach county staff to listen. (Need changes that are not what the staff wants).
- Meetings always in town – get out in the rural area.
- Hard to get real people.
- Process makes sense.
- Carve up the discussion of issues into discreet subjects. Too overwhelming for public.
- Use multiple communication media.
- People relate to growth issue.
- There is a sense that the county's going to do what it is going to do.
- Information needs to be geared to people at different cognitive levels.
- Need simple ways to respond.
- Listen.
- Process seems well organized.
- Survey overall community, not just 400 people.
- Large ads. – simple, cut and dried.
- People are curious, address need for broad information.
- Need accountability to those who participate.
- Needs to represent public at large.
- Good issues list.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- Like having a better core in downtown Vancouver.
- Keep a rural center “rural” (no industry).
- Distinguish between city (urban) and county (rural).
- Rural folks have been neglected in meeting needs of growth.

Variety of Housing

- More affordable housing.
- 60/40 split seems insane – market should drive it.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Do not need to expand UGA.

Concurrency

- Concurrency is good idea.
- Use our existing resources to help meet needs of growth.
- Infrastructure – need to plan the whole county for growth.

Zoning

- Zone with buffers to industry.
- Extended families cannot cluster anymore.
- Should be mandatory that planners and commissioners visit site that is to be rezoned.

Population Growth

- Population projections – cannot go on like this forever.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- More housing/acre.
- Not supportive of high density – it puts all the focus on Vancouver. Other areas cannot find work close to them. People in this area need space.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- How to get jobs and businesses together – better planning.
- Unrealistic to assume you can get people to live near jobs.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- *Need a sense of place.
- “Sense of place” – takes a good plan and implementation.
- All looks the same
- Cannot walk to services
- Too car-oriented

Resource Lands

- Revisit resource lands. There have been profound changes in how we grow.
- Define commercial viability of farming. Need more careful accommodation of those who need to withdraw from agricultural land. Too hard to get exceptions, such as Homestead Preservation Act.
- Define commercial liability. Cannot understand why some lands zoned resource lands when not viable – better for industry.

Environmental

- ESA is wildcard.
- Development practices – do not remove all vegetation.
- Good job on trails and waterways.
- Revisit codes requirements and criteria for environmental checklist – for today’s environment. Codes do not provide sufficient protection for the environment.

Other Comments

- Simpler permitting and plan reviews.
- Eliminate septs, private wells and mini mansions.
- How do we protect people from changing regulations – unpredictability.
- Use incentives.
- Lack of planning
- Should not have the same regulations.
- Today’s comp plan not suitable to the county today. Needs to address the diversity in the county.
- Growth is because it is a viable place to be.
- Rail line is a diamond in the rough. Great potential for moving and goods within the county.

CAMAS
CAMAS CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
AUGUST 23, 2000
4-5:30PM

Attendees

Winston Jacobson
Alison Mielke, Friends of Clark County
Sheldon Tyler, Port of Camas Washougal
Ralph Gilbert, Citizen
Marilyn Roth, Citizen
Leo Grobli, Grange
Bill Dygert, Citizen
Don Steinke

Staff

Marty Snell, City of Camas
Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
Elise Scolnick, Clark County Community Development
Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Do not really have any expectations. Know we need to (plan for) growth
- Strengthen direction we are going. Generally going to the right direction.
- It is a good thing that the plan is being reviewed and not just sitting on a shelf. We cannot control population – our reality exceeded our projections.
- Agree with previously mentioned issues.
- Happy to see the survey of voters in process.
- Think that many policies have been driven by speculative development.
- 20 years is too short.
- Questions for survey:
 - What population do you think should be here in the next 50 years?
 - (Something like...) How do we redefine prosperity so it is not so linked to growth. Need to investigate a new economic mode with/at growth. Cannot grow forever
- Process needs to be inclusive, provide many opportunities for public to plug in.
- Look to the 50-year mark.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

- What is the relationship between urban dwellers supporting protection of rural resources.

Variety of Housing

- 60/40 example – just saying we “want it” is not enough. What does it mean to implement the policies.
- Do not have enough variety – housing mix needs to be addressed.

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

Concurrency

- How do we help public understand the connection between public dollars and public facilities/level of service.
- Need community support for creative financing – legislative help.

Zoning

- Renewable zoning – need to determine impacts to adjacent properties for planned development. Maintain minimum lot size.

Population Growth

- What are OFM population forecasts? When will they become final? Which number do you use – low, medium, high?
- Greatest threat to environment is development driven by population growth. The issues list assumes that we cannot control population growth. Would like to see on the list. Do we want to discourage or encourage population growth? (See Don's handout).
- Do we want to choose the low, medium, high population forecast? Can we choose the low and plan for that? In the past, city/county has taken the high.
- If we choose low, are we putting up blinders? Isn't there an obligation to plan for the high since we have exceeded the forecasts so far.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Concerned about ability of larger lots (40-acre etc.) being able to put another house on it. How do we account for those holding acreage within UGA that do not want to subdivide?
- Unsure if we are handling our density targets well. Easy for growth to outpace quality of life.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Airport protection/protection zones industrial property – where will it go? Cottonwood Beach/recreation opportunities. Three ports in the area – need to include! Recreation/economic/industrial. “Government agency in the private arena.”
- Location of large employers dictating to some degree where housing/development will occur, difficult to dictate what really will happen in the future.
- No tax breaks for large industry.
- Industry is coming here because of the airport potential/proximity.
- Favor family wage jobs. Put jobs in first. Does not pay to subsidize businesses to come in.
- Be mindful of the kind of industry that is coming here. What is the long-term viability?

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- I live in an area that will be “housed out”, no parks, trees have been taken down – concerned that it will become undesirable place to live – where is the quality of life question? Not addressed in the comp plan.
- Rather than say “what do we do to respond to growth”, say “what kind of community do we want to be.”

Resource Lands

- We need to do everything we can to maintain/support resource lands in the county. Need to revisit this.
- If growth gets ahead of planning, we need to bite the bullet and slow things down. We need a more common sense approach to resource land in UGA. Do not tax them out of business.

Environmental

- Make a positive inventory of our natural resources, especially now.
- Clean air/water.
- Need to update ordinances – strengthen those areas. Need to do everything we can to protect and preserve critical areas:
 - Fish/wildlife habitat area
 - Anadromous fish populations
 - ESA/salmon steelhead
 - Open space – river systems – develop a vision as part of this update.
- When parks, wildlands are impacted the problems are not as apparent as school and transportation impacts.

Transportation

- Vehicle miles traveled is increasing faster than population. Need a variety of uses close together. Rely on other modes of transportation.
- Do we want to continue to lower our level of service in response to growth? Where do we stop? What does the picture look like?

Other Comments

- Cultural – how is this addressed in the plan? Needs to be addressed.
- Determine relationship to PDX.
 - Growth potential is great
 - Third runway
 - Landing spaces
 - Impacts associated with growth
 - Coordination between Port of Portland/Vancouver
 - Airport will draw industry here to the county
- Does economic/vitality depend on a certain growth rate? Get clarity here.
- Need parks to allow land to breathe.
- Camas has done a good job protecting open space.
- Our community was “about right” 15 years ago.
- Need impact fees that more accurately reflect the growth.
- Do not build infrastructure (schools) prior to homes to support the development. Homes should pay for schools, etc. Use impact fees to pay for infrastructure.

WASHOUGAL

WASHOUGAL CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

AUGUST 23, 2000

7-8:30PM

Attendees

Brandi Baker, C-W Chamber
Lance Killian, Killian Pacific
Will Edgerly, Citizen
Ralph Hutchison, Planning Commission
Morry Secrest, Wash. Planning Commission
Monty Anderson, Washougal
Jeff Guard, Washougal
Judie Stanton, County Commissioner
Henry Gerhard, Citizen
Kathy Kiwala, League of Women Voters
Darrell Badertscher, Citizen
Kenneth Hadley, CCAR

Staff

Evan Dust, Clark County Community Development
Elise Scolnick, Clark County Community Development
Jamie Damon, Jeanne Lawson Associates, Inc.

QUESTION 1 – PROCESS EXPECTATIONS, CONCERNS & ADVICE

- Not sure what my expectations are for this ‘round. Good questions outlined in flyer. Less constraints from the state this time around. Hope to answer questions. No magic answer.
- Need to resolve those unresolved issues that we were not able to address since 1994.
- Would like to see countywide understanding of problem agreement about options to resolve the issues.
- What is a comprehensive plan and why are we updating it? Feel like the document is not up to the task we need it to do. It is easy to come to expect this process to resolve a level of detail that it is not designed.
- Plan should be guide. We can put targets out there. That is all they are.
- This is an evolutionary process. The plan has a level of detail that is greater than before. We have gotten better about planning. Washougal has had an opportunity to acquire 30 acres of park land. Verification of what we have done.
- Public education/awareness. More people involved the better. County doing a good job of that.
- County needs to be on “cutting edge” of planning. Fastest growing area (in county?). Look to other areas, other modes.
- People need to understand review process:
 - City
 - County
 - State/GMA
- How is comp plan used to guide city plans?
- Process needs to be easy to digest. Ease of administration from city’s end. Monitoring report is good.
- More citizen input! Newsletters, surveys, meetings are good.
- Visioning process from cities – ideal of where we want to go – need help implementing.
- Provide a graphic depiction of how county is talking about the issues.

QUESTION 2 - ISSUES

Balancing Growth in Rural and Urban Areas

Variety of Housing

- Need to be careful of the terminology/specificity in the plan. A duplex or 7000 square feet is “multi-family”, but three single family houses on 2500 square foot lot is not. Yet it has high density.
- Does 60/40 split only apply to new development? *Yes and redevelopment.*
- How was 60/40 arrived at?
- How do you implement a paper policy that lays out a mix of development?

Revisiting Urban Growth Areas

- Available, buildable land needs to be looked at – county and the development community disagree.
- Developable land inventory/fine tuning.

Concurrency

- Reality of growth, insufficient infrastructure.

Zoning

- At the end of the 1994 process there were many conflicts between cities/counties – zoning. Need to resolve these this time around.
- Zoning. How do you make sure that the kinds of development that would be helpful and put in place in the zone. How do you make sure that the kinds of development that would be helpful are put in place in the zone.

Population Growth

- Computer model OFM are using for population forecasts seem seriously flawed. This is a basic assumption.
- Need to be realistic with population forecasts.

How Many Homes Per Acre

- Lot sizes, if in town, small/outside town, 5-10 acre nice – perhaps lot sizes in town could be smaller, not so bad.
- Density issues need to be resolved. If you have a large lot – easier to set aside park/open space – then a small lot developer.

Locating Business, Industry, Jobs

- Washougal needs to work on jobs/housing mix within city. Will help to solve problems.

OTHER ISSUES

Quality of Life

- Who pays for protecting assets? Quality of life?

Environmental

- Trees, open space, agriculture – how do we protect?
- Conflict within UGA about land being set aside for habitat/protection and where people fit in that.

- Where is open space, parks, things like that? City needs help – county/state will be there to help.
- ESA impacts.
- Private golf club as open space?
- Does the city/county have a way to inventory resources/assets in the county? *Yes.*
Conservation futures – open space protected.

Transportation

- Transportation is a big problem.
- No synchronization of traffic signals. What is that about!?
- We need to figure out how to move people if we are going to bring them into the area.
- Traffic will get worse – need to get mass transit or radar screen.
- City is struggling with infrastructure facilities – widen SR14.
- Do not want it to be easy to drive anytime of day. It is a trade off question

Other Comments

- We will be L.A. with rain if we do not do something about it.
- Hard to speak about the plan without getting into the ordinance level of detail.
- Need to balance community and development needs – work it out.
- Agree with much of above. Density, quality of life, congestion, etc.
- Need to market communities better.
- *Public/private partnerships – creative way to provide incentives – implementation.